REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2007. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 12-15, 21, and 25 are amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending in view of the above amendments, claims 28-36 having been withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

Election/Restriction

Applicant acknowledges the election of claims 1-27 as identified in the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0162032 (*Li*). Because *Li* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks and the amendments to the claims.

Embodiments of the invention are directed to the tokenized compression of session initiation protocol (SIP) data. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the compressed message includes both a tokenized message having both a list of tokens and a message dictionary. The tokens included in the tokenized message include first

tokens assigned from a standard dictionary and second tokens assigned to access the message dictionary included in the tokenized message.

Figure 5 of the specification illustrates an example of a compressed message. In this example, the compressed message includes the message dictionary and the tokenized message. Some of the tokens in the tokenized message are assigned in order to access the message dictionary. As a result, the SIP message is entirely tokenized in the tokenized message.

Li, in contrast, fails to teach or suggest the compressed message required in claim 1. More specifically, *Li* teaches a message that an SIP/SDP message is parsed into pieces that each have a static component and a variable component. *See* ¶[0009], ¶[0032] and Figure 5. However, only the static component is replaced by a corresponding token. *See Id.* The variable component may be compressed, but there is no teaching that the variable component is also replaced with a token. This teaches away from the requirements of claim 1, which includes second tokens assigned to access the message dictionary.

In fact, *Li* specifically states that "the compressed message contains the token corresponding to the static component and data (not a token) corresponding to the variable component. *See* ¶[0011]. *Li* further states that the original sub-string (including the static component and the variable component) is replaced with a token and a modified sub-string. *See* ¶[0039].

Figure 6 of *Li* further illustrates that, for a selected sub-string (which includes a static component and a variable component), a token is generated for the static component and the variable component may be modified.

In *Li*, the compressed message to be transmitted is generated by concatenating token/sub-string pairs. *See* Figure 6 and 7. This requirement of concatenating introduces some potential overhead because it then becomes necessary, according to *Li*, to "have some mechanism for determining when the end of the modified sub-string has been reached." *See* ¶[0044]. To determine the end, *Li* teaches that the modified sub-string may be terminated with a [CRLF] character. Alternatively, *Li* suggests that the message is searched for recognizable tokens, or that one or more extra bytes are

included with the token to indicate the length of the modified sub-string, a process that adds an "extra byte or more of overhead for every sub-string." *See* ¶[0044].

The compressed message of claim 1, in contrast, does not rely on modified sub-strings for each static component of each sub-string. Rather, the compressed message is tokenized in the tokenized message, which enables the compressed message to be reconstructed by simply using the tokens in the tokenized message. The first tokens can be used to access a standard dictionary and the second tokens, for example, have been assigned to the tokenized message and can be used to access the message dictionary included in the compressed message.

The inclusion of a message dictionary that is accessed with the assigned second tokens is not taught or suggested by a sub-string that is terminated with a [CRLF] character or by extra bytes that indicate the length of sub-strings. The message dictionary and tokenized message are further not taught or suggested by the teaching in *Li* of searching the sub-string for recognizable tokens. Advantageously, the compressed message of claim 1 can be non-CPU intensive, while *Li* suggests that a search may be required or that an extra byte (and accompanying over-head) may be added for each sub-string. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

Similar to claim 1, claim 13 requires that the compressed message include a message dictionary and a tokenized message that includes first tokens and second tokens. The compressed message is decoded by using the first tokens to access a standard dictionary and the second tokens to access the message dictionary included in the compressed message. Thus, the compressed message received in claim 13 can be decompressed using the message dictionary and the tokens included in the tokenized message. The first tokens are used to access a standard dictionary (which may be common between two devices involved in the communication) and the second tokens are used to access the message dictionary.

In contrast, the sub-strings taught by *Li* are not accessed using tokens in the tokenized message, but must be regenerated (*see* Figure 7) in another manner. As discussed above, for example, the sub-strings taught by *Li* are not tokenized.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is also patentable over the cited art. The independent claim 25 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed herein. Also, the dependent claims rejected under § 102 are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Li* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,143,191 (*Chuah*).

The Examiner suggests that *Chuah* discloses a dynamic message dictionary of claim 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees at least because the dynamic dictionary of *Chuah* "is kept as long as packets belonging to the context keep arriving." *See* col. 2, lls. 50-52. This suggests that the dynamic message dictionary is discarded. Further, the compression taught by *Chuah* relates to the LZSS compression algorithm (which processes a file from left to right (*see* col. 3, lls. 62-63)), which is distinct from the tokens required in claim 9.

Claim 9, in contrast to the teachings of both *Li* and *Chuah*, requires both a standard dictionary stored on the communication device and a message dictionary. Claim 9 further requires first tokens that are assigned from a standard dictionary and second tokens assigned to access the message dictionary included in the tokenized message. This tokenized message and message dictionary of claim 9 are not taught or suggested by a compression algorithm that processes the filed from "left to right" or that does not teach or suggest tokens.

For at least these reasons and for the reasons discussed previously, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 22 are patentable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 11th day of March, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. #45454
CARL T. REED

CARL T. REED
Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\15814\3\MJW0000001994V001.doc